

District School Board of Madison County

Greenville Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

<http://ges.madison.k12.fl.us/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Madison County School Board on 11/6/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Greenville Elementary School's mission is to provide a safe and challenging learning environment through the use of effective teaching strategies and to inspire students to use their creativity, individuality, and drive to succeed beyond the elementary level.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenville Elementary School will be relentless in our dedication to lay a foundation for success in our students' future in college, career, and as community leaders.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Selph, Wallace	Principal	Execute the duties of Principal
Hopkins, Mannika	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher Lead teacher and advisor to administration Local knowledge of the community and families Pillar of the school

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SAC

Peer Review

District Support

We will present the plan and school data for the SAC Committee

Feedback was sought from stakeholders of the school and the community

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will with DOE visits and district site visits.
 SIP will also be monitored after FAST data, and district progress monitoring assessments.
 Support from K-12 lift will also revisit the plan

Demographic Data
 Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students (BLK)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: F 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	12	12	7	7	11	6	4	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	1	5	3	6	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	7	6	0	1	2	2	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	6	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	7	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	4	0	6	3	4	0	0	24

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	4	2	1	2	2	0	0	11

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	8	11	5	3	7	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	4	0	1	5	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	22

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	2	1	2	7	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	0	2	4	0	0	11

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	8	11	5	3	7	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	4	0	1	5	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	22

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	2	1	2	7	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	0	2	4	0	0	11

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	29	42	53	29	43	56	24		
ELA Learning Gains				26					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	8	45	59	25	39	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				33					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	13	36	54	20	53	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					44	64			
Middle School Acceleration					35	52			
Graduation Rate					44	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress			59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	83
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	133
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	2	2
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	23	Yes	2	2

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	1	1
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	25	Yes	1	1

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	29			8			13					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			4			13				4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	31			9			13				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	29	26		25	33		20					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	21	19		19	28		18					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	26	24		24	36		15					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	24			35								
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			33								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	21			33								

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	6%	37%	-31%	54%	-48%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	46%	-7%	58%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	27%	34%	-7%	47%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	41%	-13%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	20%	37%	-17%	54%	-34%
03	2023 - Spring	11%	46%	-35%	59%	-48%
04	2023 - Spring	11%	38%	-27%	61%	-50%
05	2023 - Spring	0%	32%	-32%	55%	-55%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	13%	35%	-22%	51%	-38%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Mathematics
 Lack of continuity in faculty
 teaching to the depth of the Mathematics standards

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Mathematics
 Lack of continuity in faculty
 teaching to the depth of the Mathematics standards

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Mathematics
 Lack of continuity in faculty
 teaching to the depth of the Mathematics standards

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

None, all declined

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Improve ELA, Mathematics, and Science Proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Consistency with faculty has been a problem in the past. Turn over for teachers and faculty leaving the school causes the school to be in a state of constant start over mode.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Maintain 80% of faculty from the beginning of the year until the end.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Staff attendance

Constant morale building and focus on a student and faculty centered work site.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wallace Selph (wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Monthly staff celebrations

Weekly recognitions for faculty and staff

Review exit interview

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will show if anyone left the school at the end of the year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Mathematics declined the most year over year and had the biggest gap between the state average for Mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal would be to have 50% of our students score 3 or above on the FAST assessment. We will be conducting monthly progress monitoring with the STAR assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor monthly the progress of students toward 3 or above on the monthly STAR assessment with the goal of 50% of students scoring 3 or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wallace Selph (wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize Exact Path
Reflex Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These interventions and core curriculum are research based and adopted by the district as instructional materials for use by school.
FAST Scores

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Exact Path will be used weekly to remediate instructional lessons.
Tutors will also be used to pull small groups for remediation.
Classroom walkthroughs for coaching will be completed daily by administration
Data chats will be conducted monthly after receiving our monthly progress monitoring data
District Coaches will also be meeting with teachers weekly to discuss lesson plans, data, and be conducting side by side coaching and co-teaching in classroom.

Person Responsible: Wallace Selph (wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us)

By When: Data will be monitored monthly and will be verified with FAST assessments 3 times per year.

DATA chats quarterly with families sponsored by the school

Person Responsible: Wallace Selph (wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us)

By When: These will take place every quarter of the year. 1st one to begin in October.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ESSA Subgroup of Black/African is 20 percentage points below the Federal threshold of 41%. We have determined this to be unacceptable for our students and will work to improve this data to at least the Federal average of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school will work to achieve 41% proficiency in the ESSA Subgroup of Black/African-American.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor monthly the progress of students toward 3 or above on the monthly STAR assessment with the goal of at least 41% of the subgroup scoring at level 3 or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- Utilize Exact Path
- Reflex Math
- Edmentum
- Reading Wonders

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These interventions and core curriculum are research based and adopted by the district as instructional materials for use by school.

FAST Scores

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Exact Path will be used weekly to remediate instructional lessons.
- Tutors will also be used to pull small groups for remediation.
- Classroom walkthroughs for coaching will be completed daily by administration
- Data chats will be conducted monthly after receiving our monthly progress monitoring data
- District Coaches will also be meeting with teachers weekly to discuss lesson plans, data, and be conducting side by side coaching and co-teaching in classroom.

Person Responsible: Wallace Selph (wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us)

By When: Data will be monitored monthly with the STAR assessment and 3 times yearly with the FAST assessment and state assessments.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district monitors the District Strategic Plan which includes strategies for improving school grades by increasing student achievement. The district ensures schools demonstrating the greatest need receive the highest percentage of aligned resources by utilizing the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process. Each year, schools are required to complete a Comprehensive Needs Assessment which is provided to school administrators by Special Services Coordinator. This survey is sent out in March of each year and returned to Special Services Coordinator by the end of May. Upon completion and review, the Special Services Coordinators meets with schools and District Administration team to determine a plan for acquiring needed resources.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Differentiated Instruction, and Tutors. Each strategy ensures student's individual needs are met. Teachers will also have additional support during Intervention time.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Differentiated instruction, and tutors. Each strategy ensures student's individual needs are met.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The school plans to have at least 41% of their K-2 students learn a years worth of material in a year's time on the STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The school plans to achieve a minimum of 41% in ELA on the FAST Assessment PM3

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Area of Focus will be monitored through k-12 lift Data, FAST data, and Star Assessments. The principal will review lesson plans weekly and conduct bi-weekly walk-throughs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Selph, Wallace, wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Some of the evidence based programs we plan to use are ExactPath, Read Natural 2.0 and Reading Wonders. These programs support the K-12 Reading Plan and the BEST Standards

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based on the Research of these programs it has been proven that if these students have proper implementation of Wonders, Read Natural, and Exact Path it will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will use the aforementioned curriculum and document its use weekly in weekly lesson plans.	Selph, Wallace, wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us
Teachers will use the I do We do You do Framework	Selph, Wallace, wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us
The school will hire tutors to help with small groups.	Selph, Wallace, wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us
Teachers will receive professional development training from Edumentum	Selph, Wallace, wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us
5th and 6th grade teachers will be using LLI during intervention time.	Selph, Wallace, wallace.selph@mcsbfl.us

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$18,402.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	121	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$15,000.00

			<i>Notes: Salary for approximately 6 teachers will have an extra four hours per week after school during the FY 2023-24 school for 25 weeks for lesson planning, planning with instructional coach, MTSS data analysis and planning</i>			
	5100	210	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,035.50
			<i>Notes: Retirement for approximately 6 teachers extra four hours</i>			
	5100	210	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$930.00
			<i>Notes: SS/FICA tax burden for 6 teachers' additional hours at rate of 6.2%.</i>			
	5100	221	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$217.50
			<i>Notes: Medicare tax burden for 6 teachers' additional hours at rate of 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$219.00
			<i>Notes: Workers Comp for approximately 6 teachers additional hours at rate of 1.46%</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$23,012.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	7710	510	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,680.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies: The school administrator will utilize funds to purchase supplies which may include, but are not limited to the following: pens, pencils, papers, binders, copy paper, toner (color for printing students assessment data reports to send to parents), boxes, notepads, paperclips, post-it notes, meeting materials,</i>			
	5100	150	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$17,600.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Maximum of Two Tutors: Tutors will provide unique, support for students and tailor learning to meet individual student needs based on student data. Tutors will work up to 20 hours each week and be paid at the state minimal \$15 hourly wage and up to \$20.00 per hour for 22 weeks.</i>			
	5100	220	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,100.00
			<i>Notes: FICA/Medicare tax burden for two tutors at 6.25%</i>			
	5100	221	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$255.50
			<i>Notes: Medicare tax burden for two tutors at rate of 1.45%</i>			
	5100	240	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$256.96
			<i>Notes: Worker's Compensation insurance for two tutors at 1.46%</i>			
	5100	510	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$119.94
			<i>Notes: Supplies</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				\$8,175.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0091 - Greenville Elementary School	UniSIG		\$8,175.60

	<i>Notes: Top Score Writing Curriculum that is aligned to new B.E.S.T. standards. Top Score uses researched based best practices for writing. It will aid African American Students in the area of Reading and Writing.</i>	
		Total: \$49,590.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No